

REMARKS

By way of the present response, claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended with claims 1, 8 and 15 being independent. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-16, 19-21 and 25-33 currently are pending.

The office action includes a rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-16, 19-21 and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement asserting the term “connectively contained” is not found in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8 and 15 to cancel “connectively contained” and recite “a plurality of parts being coupled to a power supply within the apparatus” as set forth above. Support for these amendments can be found at least in FIG. 1 at 12, 14(1)-14(3) and paragraphs [0015] to [0016] in the published patent application. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Office has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-16, 19-21 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,769 to McLean (McLean), claims 28, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,398,257 to Groenteman (Groenteman), and claims 31, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean, in view of Groenteman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,494,370 to Sanchez (Sanchez).

With respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, the Office asserts McLean discloses (col. 5, line 51- col. 6, line 4) RFID checktag A (there are a plurality of checktags in the system) with memory 168, and control logic 166. The Office also asserts McLean discloses a radio frequency communication system (Abstract) with a controller adapted to send and received data from two subsets of a plurality of transponders (checktags). Additionally, the Office asserts control logic 166 accesses the memory 168 to read and for write data therefrom. Further, the Office asserts col. 5, line 55, in McLean discloses the control logic 166 controls the functions of the RFID checktag A 160 in response to commands provided by the Base station 120 (interrogating). The Office asserts col. 6, lines 5-67 in McLean disclose a series of queries and checks of a plurality of checktags, receiving information and providing optimization settings. Additionally, the Office notes col. 6, lines

64-67 in McLean applies generally to any communication system where a base unit communicates with one or more transponders, *e.g.*, tags.”

However, amended claims 1 and 8 recite, *inter alia*, the features of “a plurality of parts being coupled to a power supply within the apparatus,” and similar concepts are recited in the context of the apparatus in amended claim 15. (See paragraphs [0015] to [0016] of the published patent application).

The claimed subject matter operates to gather information from one or more parts of a plurality of parts being connectively contained within an apparatus and is directed to optimizing performance of at least one operation performed by the apparatus including mechanisms for optimizing performance of at least one operation performed by the apparatus. For instance, as shown in FIG. 1 and described in paragraphs [0008] to [0009] of the published patent application, an apparatus may include a plurality of parts connectively contained within the apparatus (see FIG. 1 at 12 and 14(1) to 14(3)). Each of the plurality of parts includes an information component (*e.g.*, items 16(1) to 16(3)), which in turn, includes memory (*e.g.*, 22(1)-22(3)) and a processor (*e.g.*, (20(1)-20(3)) (see, paragraph [0008] of published patent application). The claimed subject matter makes it possible to interrogate any of the parts determined needed for the operation being optimized, and to obtain information stored in the memories about those parts (see, paragraphs [0014] and [0015] of the published patent application, and original claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 17 and 18).

It is respectfully submitted that McLean does not teach or disclose the features of interrogating one part of a plurality of parts being coupled to a power supply within the apparatus, each of said parts including a respective information component comprising memory and a processor, as presently claimed. While McLean is concerned with a method and system for automatically adjusting a radio frequency communication system, it is directly to an entirely different device and operation. Specifically, McLean describes an RFID checktag A system with a memory and control logic. McLean further describes a radio frequency communication system including a controller adapted to send and received data from two subsets of a plurality of transponders (checktags). The control logic accesses the memory to read and for write data therefrom. (See col. 5: 55). However, McLean does not teach or disclose the claimed features relating to a plurality of parts being coupled to a power

supply within the apparatus. In contrast, FIG. 1 of McLean appears to show apparatus 120 and apparatus 160 and/or apparatus 170 only being wirelessly connected and not capable of being coupled to a power supply. Therefore, Applicant contends that McLean fails to teach or disclose the features of a plurality of parts being coupled to a power supply within the apparatus, as presently claimed. Thus, it cannot be said that McLean anticipates the features of the present invention.

With respect to the rejection of claims 28, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McLean, in view of Groenteman, it is respectfully submitted that the Groenteman patent, which is relied upon for describing a copy machine and a processor that gathers and generates status information and transmits using a wireless transceiver, does not remedy the shortcomings pointed out above with respect to McLean. Rather, Groenteman appears to describe a printer device including only one processor for gathering and generating status information about the device (see, column 2, lines 25-27) from sensor or information ports within the copying circuitry (see, column 2, lines 42-44), and Groenteman does not otherwise mention details of the parts of the device.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. *MPEP §2142*. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art must teach all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2142*. The combined references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present application.

Applicant respectfully points to the final prong of the test, which states the prior art must teach all the claim limitations. At the very least, the combined references do not teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 8 and 15, as discussed above.

Sanchez does not cure the deficiencies of McLean and Groenteman as mentioned above. Therefore, Applicant notes that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable as discussed previously. Any claim that depends from an allowable claim is

allowable as well. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to dependent claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 16, 19-21 and 25-33 be removed.

The methods and apparatus of present invention facilitate use of “smart” parts in an apparatus, for example, use of parts having relaxed and/or changing tolerances, wherein such characteristics are stored in memory of information components of the parts. By accessing and receiving the information stored in the part through interrogation of the parts, instructions can be determined and transmitted to the parts to optimize one or more operations of the apparatus without sacrificing performance of the apparatus. It is respectfully submitted that the methods and apparatus of McLean and Groenteman do not suggest any such methods and mechanisms for receiving information from an information component of a part and implementing instructions at the information component of the part.

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 16, 19-21 and 25-30 depend from one of claims 1, 8 and 15, and are therefore allowable at least for the above reasons, and further for the additional features recited.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and allowance of this application. Prompt notification of the same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2007

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. # 48103/
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Gunnar G. Leinberg, Reg. No. 35,584
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603-1051
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600